envisaged in the Bombay High Court's Order and a speaking order will be passed only thereafter.

(e) The question of taking action against any officer would arise only after the liability is finally determined.

Reduction in custom duty on Cofotaxim

144. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) when was the custom duty on Cefotaxim reduced and when the effect of duty reduction was given in the prices of formulations;

(b) what was the price before reduction and what is the price after reduction per injection;

(c) what is the benefit made by each producer at the cost of the consumer;

(d) what steps have been taken to fix responsibility for this lapse and what steps have been taken to recover this amount; and

(e) by when the amount would be recovered and responsibility fixed in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) The custom duty on Cefotaxim was reduced to 0% vide Notification No. 125/91-Customs dated 11th September, 1991. But actual import at 0% Custom duty was effected in December, 1991 only as the name of bulk drug Cefotaxim Sodium was corrected by Ministry of Finance vide their Notification No. 145/91-Customs dated the 7th November, 1991. The prices of formulations were reduced by the major formulators from May, 1992. The price per via of injection of Cefotaxim Sodium was Rs. 198.80 (inclusive of all taxes) before May, 1992 and from May, 1992 the price has been reduced by the company to Rs. 143.00 per vial (inclusive of all taxes).

(c) to (e) Information is being collected from the maior formulators and further action as permissible under the provisions of DPCO, 1987 would be taken thereafter.

Recommending lower price by BICP

145. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1130 given in Rajya Sabha on 7th May, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that BICP had recommended lower price for Betamethasone and its salts in 1990 without R&D benefit;

(b) if so, what are the grounds on which it was decided to continue with the higher price;

(c) what is the difference between the price that has been allowed to continue and the price that was recommended by the BICP;

(d) whether the magnitude runs in crores every year; and

(e) if so, what action has been taken against all those involved in this affair and by when an enquiry into the matter would be instituted?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) The BICP submitted its report on bulk drug Betamethasone and its Salts in 1990 after including the benefit on account of cost reduction due to R & D efforts. For this report BICP considered the actual cost of production for the financial year ending 30.6.88. BICP recommended continuation of prices as notified in January, 1989. Government, however did not agree to include the benefit of cost reduction due to R&D efforts. Before the prices could be notified on the basis of BICP report without R&D benefit, the company represcuted to the Govt. that the prices of raw material and utilities have gone up, since the time of the BICP study and requested to consider the current cost of raw material and utiilties for fixing the revised prices. After examining the company's representation, it was decided

to continue the prices as were notified in January, 1989.

Cost-cum-technical study

146. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to unstarred question 1141 given in Rajya Sabha on 7th, May 92 and state;

(a) whether it is a fact that Government are misleading by informing that cost-cum-technical study of the data of M/s. Boots, M/s. Methoni and M/s. Camlin in respect of Diloxanide Furoate was conducted;

(b) whether it is a fact that price was recommended by the BICP for this drug based on the cost data of M/s Boots only and no other company, if so, when was the report sent to Government;

(c) whether it is a fact that the price of the bulk drug was increased based on the cost data of M/s Boots only;

(d) whether it is also a fact that production of Diloxanide Furoate in the production returns compiled by this own Ministry in 1990-91 and 1991-92 is Zero: and

(e) if so, on what basis was then esclalation given based on the data of M/s. Boots?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) No, Sir.

(d) Production returns for the year 1990-91 and 1991-92 have not been compiled so far.

(e) Does not arise

Report of HICP

147. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1130 given in the Rajya Sabha on 7th May, 1992 and state;

(a) whether it is a fact that BICP in its report of 1990 recommended reduction in price of Betamethasone and its salts;

(b) whether it is a fact that to cover up this reduction they recommended 50 per cent cost reduction benefit on the ground of R&D;

(c) what was the benefit recommended per gm of the drug saltwise and what basis recommendation of the BICP for giving this benefit was accepted;

(d) whether it is a fact that the price worked out by the BICP in 1990 were lower than recommneded by Murthy Committee as well as existed price;

(e) if so, whether it has been proved *prima facie* that Murthy committee was wrong; and

(f) if so, whether Government have proposed any action against Murthy Committee for omissions and commission for consideration?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) No, Sir.

(c) The recommendation regarding benefit of cost reduction due to R&D efforts was not accepted by the Government.

(d) BICP recommendation was to continue the existing prices, notified in January, 1989.

(e) and (f) Do not arise.

Marketing of proxyvon revital and Ibudex-capsules

148. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1140 given in the Rajya Sabha on 7th May, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that cases of overcharging of price and marketing of Proxyvon revital and Ibudex Capsules occured in 1984 and since then on one pretext or the other Government are withholding action against the producer;